



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,619	12/21/2000	Steven D. Woods	7784-000156	1126
7590	05/30/2006		EXAMINER	
Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C. P. O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303			THAI, HANH B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/746,619	WOODS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hanh B. Thai	2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 3/15/06.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-17,19,20,22-27 and 30-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-17,19,20,22-27 and 30-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The following is Final Office Action in response to the amendment filed March 16, 2006.

Independent claims 1 and 25 have been amended. Claims 2, 18, 21 and 28-29 have been cancelled. Claims 30-35 are newly added. Claims 1, 3-17, 19-20, 22-27 and 30-35 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments regarding "a notification device that provides at least one of said single collaboration group and more than one collaboration group with notification data based on said entries in a card catalog" (page 9) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments regarding "populate a card catalog" (page 10) have been considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner respectively disagrees.

Horovitz clearly discloses the modifications of the information on online catalog and a user can access the sought information on the online catalog (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67; col.4, lines 50-62 and col. 5, lines 31-46, Horovitz), in light of the specification page 23, lines 5-8, this teaching reads on the claimed "populate a card catalog."

3. Applicant's arguments regarding "a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual stewards to populate a card catalog based on the technology-specific terminology data and collaboration input" (page 11) have been considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner respectively disagrees.

Horovitz clearly discloses a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual steward (company A, Fig 2, is equivalent to an individual steward) to populate a card catalog based on

collaboration input (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67 and col. 5, lines 31-46, Horovitz).

Please note that “Internet online catalog” is equivalent to web-based collaboration tool, “LinkGraph” is equivalent to card catalog and the “input received from a multiple information resources” reads on the collaboration input.

Wical discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-64, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Therefore, The combination system of Horovitz and Wical disclose the claimed “a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual stewards to populate a card catalog based on the technology-specific terminology data and collaboration input.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-17, 19-20, 22-27 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horovitz et al. (US Patent 6,389,409) of record in view of Wical (US Patent 6,487,545) of record and further in view of Nichols et al. (US Pub. 2003/0055652 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Horovitz discloses a technology management system comprising:

- a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual steward (company A, Fig 2, is equivalent to an individual steward) to populate a card catalog based on collaboration

input (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67 and col. 5, lines 31-46, Horovitz). Please note that “Internet online catalog” is equivalent to web-based collaboration tool, “LinkGraph” is equivalent to card catalog and the “input received from a multiple information resources” reads on the collaboration input; and

- Fig. 2 of Horovitz teaches an “Internet site” that is equivalent to a web portal for maintaining a bookshelf of links to entries in the card catalog, the web portal further accessing the bookshelf based on search input catalog (see col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43 and col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz).

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claimed feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to scan the multiple information resources and update (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Horovitz and Wical combination does not disclose generating a notification to a plurality of different users within common or different collaboration groups. Myers discloses product catalog for use in a collaborative engineering environment including identifying any update to product catalog by collaborative group (see col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz and Wical to include the claimed feature as taught by Myers. The motivation

of doing so would have been to provide the users cooperative capabilities of sharing information over the enterprise network.

Regarding claim 3, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses that the collaboration tool retrieves the collaboration input directly from at least one of the stewards (see col. 7, lines 35-38, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 4, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses that the collaboration tool retrieves the collaboration input from an electronic file, at least one of the stewards placing the collaboration input in the electronic file (see col. 7, lines 35-41, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 5, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses that the collaboration tool converts the collaboration input into metadata, the collaboration input having a corresponding content (see col. 17, lines 17-21, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 6, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses “the category or the input” (col.6, line 36, Horovitz) corresponds to the keyword attribute information, the keyword attribute information defining keywords relating to the content.

Regarding claim 7, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the collaboration tool further converts the technology-specific terminology data into metadata based on the collaboration input (see col. 7, lines 49-67, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 8, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the category or ranks the link of the content that reads on the readiness attribute information, the readiness attribute information defining a readiness for linking of the content to the bookshelf (see col. 7, lines 16-18, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 9, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the metadata includes steward attribute information, the steward attribute information defining a responsible party for the content. The information about “company A” (Fig.2, Horovitz) corresponds to the steward attribute information.

Regarding claim 10, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the information about “company A” in Fig.2 of Horovitz that reads on author attribute information, the author attribute information defining an author of the content.

Regarding claim 11, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes location attribute information, the location attribute information defining a file location of the content (see col. 6, lines 45-57, Horovitz). Please note that “URL” is the location information defining a file location of the content.

Regarding claim 12, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes notification attribute information, the notification attribute information defining individuals to be notified of the conversion of the collaboration input into metadata (see col. 17, lines 17-21, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 13, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the security attribute information. But, it is obvious to obtain security requirements for accessing the content.

Regarding claim 14, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes date attribute information, the date attribute information defining a conversion date for the collaboration input (see col. 8, lines 46-47, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 15, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes title attribute information, the title attribute information defining a title for the content (see col. 6, line 59, Horovitz). “Catalog name” is equivalent to the title of the content.

Regarding claim 16, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the collaboration tool interacts with the card catalog over a networking connection (see Fig.2, Horovitz).

Regarding claims 17 and 20, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the networking connection comprises one of an Internet connection and an intranet connection (see col. 5, lines 32-33, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 19, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the web portal interacts with the card catalog over a networking connection (see col. 5, lines 47-51, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 22. The management system of claim 1 wherein the web portal includes a user interface, the user interface being customizable based on interface input from a user (see col. 3, lines 34-38, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 23, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the user interface includes links contained in the bookshelf (see fig.2 and corresponding text, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 24, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the terminology data relates to airplane technologies (see col. 47, lines 44-65, Wical). “Industry” term is one of many of the terms relate to various aspects of airplane manufacturing and design. Thus, the terminology data relates to aircraft technologies.

Regarding claim 25, Horovitz discloses a method for managing technologies among a plurality of individuals operating within a common collaboration group or within different collaboration groups, the method comprising the steps of: populating a card catalog (col. 5, lines

47-54, Horovitz) over a networking connection based on collaboration input (col. 6, lines 36-37) from a plurality of independent stewards (col. 4, lines 50-62); maintaining a bookshelf of links over the networking connection based on entries in the card catalog (col. 6, lines 45-62, Horovitz); and accessing the bookshelf based on search input from a user (col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43, Horovitz). Please note that “LinkGraph” corresponds to “card catalog”, “categories page” corresponds to “bookshelf of links”.

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claimed feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to scan the multiple information resources and update (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Horovitz and Wical combination does not disclose generating a notification to a plurality of different users within common or different collaboration groups. Myers discloses product catalog for use in a collaborative engineering environment including identifying any update to product catalog by collaborative group (see col. 16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz and Wical to include the claimed feature as taught by Myers. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide the users cooperative capabilities of sharing information over the enterprise network.

Regarding claim 26, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the steps of storing technology-specific terminology data to a controlled lexicon (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical).

Regarding claim 27, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the method wherein the stewards and the users are part of an overall enterprise group (col.4, lines 50-62, Horovitz).

Regarding claims 30 and 33, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses wherein the notification data includes an expiration data of the entries (col.1, lines 44-56 and col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers).

Regarding claims 31 and 34, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses wherein the notification data includes employment information of the individual stewards (see col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers).

Regarding claim 32, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination further discloses converting at least one of the collaboration input and the technology-specific terminology data into metadata the collaboration input having a corresponding content (col.3, line 53 to col.4, line 4, Myers).

Regarding claim 35, Horovitz discloses a technology management system comprising:

- a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual steward (company A, Fig 2, is equivalent to an individual steward) to populate a card catalog based on collaboration input (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67 and col. 5, lines 31-46, Horovitz). Please note that “Internet online catalog” is equivalent to web-based collaboration tool, “LinkGraph” is equivalent to card catalog and the “input received form a multiple information resources” reads on the collaboration input; and

- Fig. 2 of Horovitz teaches an "Internet site" that is equivalent to a web portal for maintaining a bookshelf of links to entries in the card catalog, the web portal further accessing the bookshelf based on search input catalog (see col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43 and col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz).

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claimed feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to scan the multiple information resources and update (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Horovitz and Wical combination does not disclose different collaboration groups. Myers discloses product catalog for use in a collaborative engineering environment including different collaborative groups (Fig.1, Fig.8; abstract; summary; col.5, line 35 to col.6, line 30 and col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz and Wical to include the claimed feature as taught by Myers. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide the users cooperative capabilities of sharing information over the enterprise network.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B. Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

May 15, 2006



DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER